

### REMARKS

The Examiner's action of September 1, 2009 is noted in which claims 1, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35USC112 second paragraph, with claims 1, 8 and 9 being objected to. Applicants have provided language which repairs the infirmities. Removal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

This leaves the rejection of the claims under 35USC102 and 35USC103 as being either anticipated by or obvious over Mason et al.

Applicants have recited a system in which all of the elements operate automatically formatted and adjusted in frequency to a common format and frequency.

This is nowhere shown in the Mason et al. reference.

The Examiner states that "Mason et al. 'inherently' converts..." However, Applicants cannot understand how there is anything inherent in Mason et al. to describe what is claimed.

Remembering that when different types of equipment arrive at an incident scene, the equipment cannot communicate with each other. This invention solves this problem, and this is not discussed in Mason et al.

To be sure if one had all of the control of all of the equipment arriving at an incident scene, one would establish communication by preprogramming the equipment so that all of the equipment would talk to each other.

This is never the case in real life and Applicants claim a system which alters the transmission between the equipment at the scene to a common frequency and format.

This operation is not inherent in Mason et al., nor do they discuss it.

Allowance of the claims and issuance of the case is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert K. Tandler

Reg. No.: 24,581

65 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, MA 02110

Tel: (617) 723-7268

Date:

